DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 970 JC 790 268

AUTHOR Burson, Gerald E.
TITLE A History of the Activities Which Lead to a Formal Articulation Policy for Higher Education in Oklahoma.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (59th, Chicago, Illinois, April 29-May 2, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Program); Educational History; Interinstitutional Cooperation; Junior Colleges; *Policy Formation; *Postsecondary Education; State Colleges; *Statewide Planning; *Transfer Policy; Transfer Programs; Transfer Students; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Oklahoma

ABSTRACT

Several factors influenced the development of a system-wide articulation policy by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Enrollment patterns were changed by the creation of metropolitan community colleges and by the influx of first-time and older, non-traditional students. Increasingly, pressures were placed on the system to provide for the efficient transfer of students from two-year colleges to four-year colleges and universities. In the 1940's, one-day conferences were held to identify problems and to inform two-year colleges of how to alleviate them. Later, the Intercollege Council on Student Transfers was created. The Council, which met between May 1967 and November 1969, addressed issues affecting transfer students, and provided the first open debate about the problems of articulation. Subsequent efforts were made by two-year college deans of instruction and faculty to create a "common core of general education courses" required for an associate of arts degree. On February 14, 1972, the ten state public four-year colleges and all public and private junior colleges signed an articulation agreement based on this core. After modifications, agreements with the two state universities were signed. The State Regents then reviewed the articulation policy and mandated its full implementation by fall 1978. Appendices contain the articulation agreements. (MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169970

A History of the Activities Which Lead to a Formal Articulation Policy for Higher Education in Oklahoma

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gerald E. Burson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By

Gerald E. Burson, Ed.D.
Dean of Instruction
Northern Oklahoma College

December 1977

JC 790 268

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education have modified and re-affirmed a system-wide articulation policy. This policy has been adopted after seven years of effort initiated and maintained by two-year college personnel.

All events of this magnitude have histories which usually are forgotten very quickly. The purpose of this brief history is to attempt to preserve the processes and factors that actively helped the decision to be reached.

The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education has seen great changes in the enrollment patterns of its institutions in the recent past. The creation of metropolitan community junior colleges and the expansion of the role of these colleges have been two of the greatest variables contributing to these changes. At the present time two additional factors are influencing the decisions concerning student access to higher education. First, more first time students are beginning their education in two-year colleges. Second, larger and increasing numbers of older adults and non-traditional students are entering higher education.

These two factors are bringing tremendous pressures on the system in the following areas: 1. The geographic locations of institutions and fiscal potentials necessary to accommodate the changes. 2. The articulation processes vital to the efficient transfer of the students from the two year to the four year colleges and universities as they pursue their educational objectives.

In the mid-sixties a study of enrollment patterns in institutions within the state system indicated that the potential for problems of articulation was growing but not really apparent. In the fall of 1963

there were 56,875 students enrolled in public higher education institutions. Eighty-eight percent, or 50,875, were enrolled in four-year colleges. Twelve percent, or 6,136, were enrolled in two-year institutions.

At this point in time, most of the two-year colleges were primarily transfer oriented institutions and few, if any, had more than one technical or career education program. Realistically, we could say that most two-year colleges were striving to become four-year institutions.

There seemed to be little need for a mutually beneficial articulation plan, because the curricular programs were designed at the four-year colleges and the two-year colleges adapted their offerings to meet that criteria. Until the mid-sixties there was no concentrated effort to highlight the need for a coordinated effort of articulated lower division--upper division degree sequences.

Communications Conferences

Conferences were started in the 1940's by the College of Agriculture at Oklahoma State University, then known as Oklahoma A&M College. Meetings were held with the A&M junior colleges that transferred their students to Oklahoma State University. During the mid-fifties the College of Engineering at Oklahoma State University began to have similar conferences and included the two and four year colleges since they sent pre-engineering students to the university. In the early 1960's these efforts were expanded to include the entire university and the state college system. The later conferences were organized by Mr. Raymond Girod, registrar at OSU.

The primary difficulty of the times, prior to 1965, was to accurately define courses as to content and structure since there was no common numbering system. Although institutions agreed that their courses were

the same, they had different titles and course numbers on various campuses. Transfer students often had a great deal of difficulty in moving from one institution to another and having their courses meet degree requirements. Then, as now, transcripts moved intact and all courses transferred, but they received varying levels of evaluation within and among institutions.

The primary difficulty was that when changes were made at the four-year colleges there was no official or unofficial process in operation to systematically communicate the changes to other state colleges.

The one-day conferences were a genuine effort to inform the two-year colleges what must be done if their students were to move easily into the four-year programs.

Typical Problems

During these years the conferences were very predictable. Questions were raised as to what difficulties were being experienced by students as they transferred. The transfer students might discover that on the four-year campuses: business law and business communications were considered upper division courses; English had changed from one five hour course to two three hour courses and then changed back within two years; mathematics courses were changed from four to five hours or from three to four hours; chemistry had been shortened from five to four hours, etc. After these conferences junior college faculty would return to their campuses and rearrange courses to "keep in step".

From a student point of view these changes brought about more frustration than serious problems, but the frustrated students blamed the two-year colleges for not offering courses that would transfer. Students

transferring in the 1960's received varying levels of treatment. Students who went directly to the registrar's office would get transcripts evaluated and if there were differences in course hours and there was only one hour difference they were usually told that their general education courses would transfer without difficulty. If, however, the student went directly to a college advisor without this transcript evaluation, there were few guarantees as to what the student would be told about his prior work. Most students received accurate information, but some had difficulties. The statistics on the number of students who had transfer problems from the 1950's to the 1970's is not available. From the minimal communication between the junior colleges and their former students, we can establish an estimate that ten to twenty percent of the transfer students experienced varying degrees of difficulties in enrollment.

To compound the problem, at a later date a student might be informed that the initial analysis of his hours completed was incorrect and the courses did meet requirements after all. In many instances the damage was done, and the student had retaken courses or revised his plans.

The kindest criticism that could be expected at this point was that transferring from a two-year to a four-year college was difficult at best. Feedback from irate students and parents to junior college administration and faculty also contained the blunt and undeserved statement, "Junior college courses just don't transfer to four-year colleges. You lose too many hours. Junior college officials have more examples than they want of this type of statement.

A second set of difficulties occurred which no one but the student controlled. A large number of students, in fact the majority of students entering college, are undecided as to their long range goals.

For many reasons, which are ancillary to this discourse and thus are by-passed, students are pressured to make a declaration as to their long range degree plans. Once this is done the student begins to follow a track that forces course choices. For a great number of students their first choice is abandoned at some point in college and another is chosen. The later a change of goals occurs the greater amount of difficulty the student can expect in reaching his degree goal in a four year period. The problem occurs at all colleges. When it happens between the sophomore and junior years, a very crucial time, and the student is transferring from one institution to another, the opportunity to blame the first institution for not preparing the student is a viable option. Many times students will blame the institution for the necessity of taking an extra semester rather than saying, "I changed my mind."

The narrative to this point has set the conditions that existed in the early 1960's. Only about 12% of the students enrolled in public higher education were in junior colleges and less than 50% of those students were transferring to four-year colleges and universities. The junior colleges were truly junior colleges and offered little if any career education opportunities.

By the middle of the 1960's community junior colleges had come of age and by the late 1960's the growth rate across the nation was one new junior college per week.

Initial Organization of Articulation

During the late sixties, the Intercollege Council on Student Transfers was created. Advantages of the council over the annual meetings at Oklahoma State University were that the agenda could have a broader scope than it

had in the past and that more of a forum approach concerning articulation problems would be possible.

Another reason for the formation of the council was the concern on the part of some institutions that the annual meeting at Stillwater was providing OSU with a recruiting advantage over other four-year schools.

Attached as appendix 1 is a list of twenty-one institutions that formed the council.

The council began officially on May 8, 1967. The records indicate that the last official meeting was held November 20, 1969.

From its initial meeting and statement of objectives the organization met bi-annually. The first product of the group was a "blue book" which contained a compilation of lower division requirements from the senior institutions. A summary of each institution's policies concerning admission of transfer students was presented in a somewhat common format. In retrospect it is interesting to note that it was not considered important that the junior colleges supply their general education programs for the "blue book."

The council continued to address the issues affecting transfer students. The following excerpts from minutes of various meetings review the steps. There are many excerpts included because it is important to provide a concise description of real issues defined by a group of concerned educational practitioners. These quotations allude to the major crucial matters that affect students' lives and the factors that affect the image of higher education to its publics. Excerpts are as follows:

<u>The Constitution of the Oklahoma Intercollege Council on Student Transfers Adopted May 8, 1967</u>

1. It shall be the purpose of the Intercollege Council on Student Transfers to facilitate better communication among the various

institutions of higher learning in Oklahoma, to study problems concerning the transfer of students from one institution to another, to make recommendations to the various institutions concerning transfer matters, and to foster greater understanding of the common and separate problems of the institutions presented.

2. The Oklahoma Intercollege Council on Student Transfers shall be composed of representatives from institutions of higher learning, both public and private, in the state of Oklahoma listed by the State Board of Regents as generally recognized colleges and universities. Each institution choosing to participate shall have one representative appointed by the President or Chief Administrator of that institution. Representatives shall be appointed for one-year terms; however, any representative may serve as often as he is reappointed.

   The Steering Committee shall be composed of representatives from as many types of institutions as is feasible, but would normally be composed of one representative from each of the following types of institutions:

   (a) State University
   (b) Independent University
   (c) State Senior College
   (d) Independent Senior College
   (e) State Junior College
   (f) Municipal Junior College
   (g) Independent Junior College

   The Steering Committee shall be subject to the call of the Chairman.

3. It shall be the responsibility of the Steering Committee to:

   (a) Prepare the agenda for Council meetings.
   (b) Plan an annual Intercollege Conference which would normally be held in the fall of the year.
   (c) Establish sub-committees composed of representatives from within the council itself or from the various institutions represented on the Council, for the purpose of studying particular problems or issues and making recommendations to the Steering Committee.
   (d) Study problems and to formulate proposals related to student transfer matters for presentation to the Council.

May 8, 1967

The subject of admission of students at one school when not readmissible at another college was introduced. After considerable discussion it was apparent that it would not be possible to reach complete agreement between colleges on the best method to handle such cases. Some schools wished to admit transfer students on the same basis as they would retain their own students, whereas others insisted that a student must be re-admissible at the college from which transferring. Still other colleges used and preferred a compromise. It was finally decided that in a way an answer had actually been reached - that each college would continue to exercise its own policy in such matters but that it would be of great assistance if the policies of other colleges could be on record and available for consultation. Dr. Baker suggested the compilation of a Blue Book which would include a listing of the practices of the different colleges on this subject and on related ones. (Mention was specifically made of varying procedures in admission of students on disciplinary probation or suspension at another school.) The Council felt that this suggestion was meritorious and recommended that the Steering Committee institute the necessary proceedings to prepare and distribute such a Blue Book.

November 16, 1967

J. R. Morris and Harvey Faust then made comments concerning the entries in the bulletin from their respective institutions, the University of Oklahoma and East Central State College. Following this presentation, there was a general discussion concerning the problems of general education requirements at the various institutions. It was suggested that perhaps there already exists a good deal of similarity in the basic lower division requirements at the various institutions and a careful study of the contents of the booklet might be profitable in discovering what agreement already exists. While the junior college people seem to feel that a better understanding of the four-year college and university requirements would aid in the guidance of their students, some of the four-year college people reflected the idea that junior colleges should plan their own programs to give students whatever they considered a good basic education and that this should be accepted by the four-year colleges as fulfilling lower division requirements. Some of the difficulties in getting the various institutions to agree to such permissiveness were discussed. No conclusions were reached and no formal action had been taken on any issue when the council adjourned for lunch.

The meeting was reopened after lunch for the purpose of discussing various suggestions concerning future areas of study of the Council. The following suggestions were made:

(1) That we should explore the whole problem of the equivalency of courses at various institutions. Some felt that we should attempt to achieve reciprocal agreements among the various institutions concerning basic courses, even though there may be great difficulty in getting everyone to agree. In further discussion it was indicated that this may be a problem which must be approached indirectly rather than directly. That is, it may be an ultimate result of all the other efforts of the Council.

(2) It was suggested that the various junior colleges state their basic degree requirements and recommendations for their degree for inclusion in the booklet.

(3) That the Steering Committee work out the procedures whereby an institution may make modifications of their information in the booklet.

(4) The whole area of grading practices was discussed and it was suggested that a survey be made of the various institutions with regard to how "D's" are handled with transfer students, how "I's" are considered and what effect repeating courses has, etc. The secretary indicated that he would prepare a survey for circulation to the Council.

Following this discussion the meeting was adjourned.

March 8, 1968

SUBJECT: Spring Meeting of Intercollege Council on Student Transfers (March 7, 1968-OU)

It was recommended and approved that a study be made on a common numbering system for courses at the various institutions. It was agreed that OU and OSU will meet first to attempt to bring their courses in line first then the others would have a basis for further study. A four digit numbering system was recommended with the first number being level of instruction and the last number of hours of credit. Middle two numbers would be departmental numbering.

Appendix 2 is a copy of a report. It does not indicate who prepared the report.

OKLAHOMA INTERCOLLEGE COUNCIL ON STUDENT TRANSFERS
Minutes of the General Meeting of the Council
November 21, 1968
St. Gregory's College

Raymond Girod, registrar at Oklahoma State University, presented a discussion of credit evaluation of non-traditional post-secondary educational experiences, such as vocational-technical, military service schools and courses, and standardized college-level examinations of various kinds. He pointed out the demand for post-high school education now being placed on young people and adults by our technological society will force institutions of higher education to evaluate non-college, post-high school educational experiences according to knowledge attained by the individual, rather than by hard and fast rules pertaining to specified course descriptions and numbers. He emphasized that we should not lower standards, but that we must become realistic. Open discussion followed the primary presentation, discussion which agreed in spirit with the main points of the speaker. One area of the discussion centered on methods of evaluation of the non-college educational experiences. There was no general agreement. It was concluded that methods would evolve through further study and through efforts directed toward the higher administrative level and the department level, the latter level being the point of origin of many problems of transfer and crediting.

OKLAHOMA INTERCOLLEGE COUNCIL ON STUDENT TRANSFERS
Minutes of the Spring Meeting of the Council
March 13, 1969
Oklahoma City University

The Spring Meeting of the Oklahoma Intercollege Council on Student Transfers was held on March 13, 1969 on the Oklahoma City University campus in the Bishop Angie Smith Chapel beginning with registration at 9:30 a.m. The meeting convened at 10:00 a.m., Harvey Faust presiding, with a panel discussion conducted by Cecil Chesser of Altus Junior College, Bill Fisher of Central State College and Kenneth Lewis of Phillips University. The discussion centered around possiblilities of increasing voluntary participation by colleges and universities in Oklahoma in basic lower-level curriculum coordination. An outline of the material presented was distributed to each member present. This discussion was followed by a discussion by E. L. Holloway, of Langston University and William Meyer of St. Gregory's College on policies, procedures and problems related to transfer students having impaired scholastic or disciplinary status. Mr. Holloway presented a copy of his remarks to members present.

SPRING MEETING
of
OKLAHOMA INTERCOLLEGE COUNCIL ON STUDENT TRANSFERS

Thursday, March 13, 1969 Oklahoma City University

Statements for discussion in reference to topic number one:

Possibilities of increased voluntary participation by colleges and universities in Oklahoma in basic lower-level curriculum coordinatio..; also, specific information on credit requirements for associate degrees at junior colleges, and maximum credit acceptance at senior colleges.

1. There is a core of subjects or information if learned by a student in the first two years of college that would adequately prepare him to begin or continue a major in any area.

2. A general education curriculum acceptable to all institutions of higher learning in the state must be formulated by college personnel somewhat removed from subject matter interest groups.

3. A committee made up of faculty members representing the various subject matter areas could never agree on a core of subjects for general education that would be acceptable to all institutions of higher learning in the state.

4. English, mathematics, science and social studies comprise the core subjects for a general education pattern.

5. The Oklahoma Intercollege Council on Student Tranfers is the best and perhaps the only group that cold formulate a core of subjects for general education that would be acceptable to all institutions of higher learning in the state.[1]

The final meeting of the Intercollege Council on Student transfers was concerned with two topics. The first was college calendars, their arrangements and the length of a semester. The second topic was transfer of mathematics courses. Appendix 3 is a copy of the agenda.

This is the last recorded meeting of the council. Searching the graveyards for organizations there is no headmarker for the ICST. If there was one, the epithet might have been: This group dared to tread the pinnacle steps of academia's mount olympus and were transfixed by Medusa, OR in the words of that great philosopher, POGO - "We have faced the enemy and found that it is us."

The organization did not die in vain. It provided the first open debate leading into the problems of articulation in higher education in Oklahoma.

Continuation Efforts

The preliminary work that was started on analyzing the basic differences among the state institutions' lower division requirements was not allowed to falter. The deans in charge of the instructional programs in the junior colleges continued to review the problems and study the materials gathered to this point.

One of the early discoveries was that there was a great deal of variety in what junior colleges were requiring of students who received the associate degree. It was apparent that the four-year colleges would indeed have difficulty in making agreements on a statewide basis with the conditions that existed in 1967-68. The differences were relatively minor considering the scope of requirements. But when all fourteen of the

junior colleges' differences were listed it was a lengthy list. These differences, though minor, are some problems that still exist today at the four-year colleges and universities.

During the following two years the instructional deans in the two-year colleges worked with the faculties of the respective campuses and among themselves to create a "common core of general education courses" required for an Associate of Arts degree.

In early 1971 the following set of recommended minimum requirements for the Associate of Arts degree was agreed upon:

Common General Education Core for Oklahoma Junior Colleges

Minimum Requirements for Associate of Arts Degree

Language Arts	8 hours	
Social & Behavioral Science	9 hours	(including History & Gov't.)
Math & Science	11 hours	
HPE&R	2 hours	(if faculties available)
Humanities	5 hours	
	35 hours	

The common core was arrived at by analyzing the requirements of the four-year colleges, the universities and the junior colleges. There was great similarity between what the state colleges were requiring as a group and what the two-year colleges were requiring. The following excerpt from a report of the two-year college dean's organization indicates there was a series of compromises among the two-year colleges as they met to finalize the plan.

The pros and cons of having a common core were discussed. Concerns seem to be:

1. Would this restrict inter-disciplinary courses in the future? (General Concensus: No)
2. Was this too rigid? (Most of us are doing this now.)
3. Would this meet all needs? (No - but would cover the six state colleges and the B.A. at the universities.)

There was some discussion concerning the degrees offered at the two-year institutions. Many offer only one degree. There seemed to be consensus that we need to offer an Associate in Applied Science for all of our career programs. Also the idea of offering an Associate in Business and an Associate in Science with slightly different general education requirements was discussed.

Once the basic core was formulated the plan was presented officially to the president's council of the state junior colleges with the rationale that this core provided a basis for approaching the state colleges on the idea of an articulation agreement. The council of presidents accepted the plan and proceeded to formalize the core plan on the respective campuses.

With this action the state junior colleges proceeded to the formation of a proposed articulation agreement. By fall 1970 both Oscar Rose and Tulsa Junior College were in full operation, and the enrollment patterns in the state colleges were beginning to change. The following information was taken from the state regents semester reports.

Fall	Public Four Year Colleges and Universities	% of Enrollment	% of Increase	Public Junior College	% of Enrollment	% of Increase	Total	
1963	50,739	89%		6,136	11%		56,875	100%
1970	74,760	85%	47.34	14,076	15%	130.00%	91,536	
1971	80,425	82%	7.6	17,731	18%	26.0	98,156	
1972	81,122	80%	.87	20,393	20%	15.0	101,515	

A committee from the junior college instructional deans association began to gather materials to formulate an articulation agreement. Copies of the completed agreements in Florida and Illinois were solicited. The agreement from the state of Florida was chosen as the better model. The goals were clearly stated and the general education program was very similar to the common core that had been adopted by the Oklahoma junior colleges.

A proposed articulation agreement was designed and a meeting was held in the summer of 1971 which included the presidents and the deans of the junior colleges to discuss the final document. After the meeting arrangements were made to meet with the deans of the ten public state colleges to open discussions on a proposed articulation statement. This joint meeting was held in the fall of 1971. At this meeting the basic differences in lower division general education programs were identified and preliminary discussions started on how to resolve the differences.

On February 14, 1972 the ten state public four-year colleges and all the public and private junior colleges signed an articulation agreement. The primary differences between the proposed agreement and the final form were requirements that the student have at least one biological and physical science course rather than two in one field and that there would not be a mathematics requirement in the basic general education core.

Since this time representatives of the "agreed" institutions have met annually to discuss problems and possible changes in the agreement. To this date the problems have been minimal and there have been no recommendations for changes.

During the developmental processes that began after the junior colleges had created a proposed document, the state regents staff was asked to review the document to guarantee that nothing in the statement conflicted with state law or policy. After the agreement was signed, the staff of the state regents was notified and a copy delivered to the office. At that time the decision to communicate with the two universities and begin work toward a similar agreement on a voluntary basis was made known to the regents staff. This approach was encouraged.

Communication With The University

Following the signing of the agreement the presidents of the two state universities were asked, through the president's council, to meet and review the articulation agreement and ascertain whether or not their institutions also could become a part of the agreement. This initial contact was made in early March of 1972 and a meeting was held in April of 1972. The first meeting was exploratory.

After this meeting the two universities began to work together to review their curricula and the articulation agreement. The next meeting between representatives of the universities and the two-year colleges was April of 1973. At this meeting the two universities presented a proposed articulation agreement. Attachment #4. This proposed agreement prepared by the universities was patterned after the working agreement that exists between the two-year and four-year colleges but was more a statement of intent of good will than a statement of substance. The results of this conference were unsatisfactory to both parties. Representatives of both groups continued to communicate and the two universities worked on what they called a "two track" system. The system essentially was to provide a Bachelor of Arts track and a Bachelor of Science track that students could follow. The two universities could not agree on a common format for the two degrees so the proposal became a four track system. Thus, it was in reality no different than the past approach. The discussion of this approach was held in July of 1973.

According to correspondence records this was the last official meeting and attempt to reach agreement on a statewide articulation agreement.

Following that time, the summer of 1973, periodic attempts were made to reconvene the groups to discuss the problems but no more meetings occurred. Concurrent within this time frame was the planned review of The Plan for the 70's.

Many items and events influenced the concern for articulation among institutions, but the Adams case highlighted the problem to those responsible for the state system of higher education in Oklahoma. In the initial plan for the 70's, which was published in July 1971, statement No. 26 said:

> 26. Formal transfer policies should be developed by 1973 to assure that a graduate of a public two-year college in Oklahoma who has successfully completed the general education requirements for the associate degree will be eligible to transfer his work to a four-year college or university without the necessity of completing additional lower-division general education courses.[2]

Since there was ongoing activity by the institutions utilizing a cooperative approach to work on the problems, no official state plan was instituted which would supercede that activity.

At about this time the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education were notified that affirmative action would have to be taken to deal with alleged discrimination problems within the state system.

The state regents staff worked with the civil rights representatives of Region VI in Dallas and the public institutions in Oklahoma to present a system-wide plan to deal with the problems that had been identified concerning access to higher education by minorities in the state. One of the major points of that plan was assurances that students starting in junior colleges and other institutions would have consistent and easy access to further higher education - especially where an institution had the only program in the state.

The infusion of the civil rights matter into the articulation problems of the institutions pinpointed the issue and indicated that the problems were system-wide and not just a junior college concern. It also highlighted the fact that the voluntary efforts to bring about a solution were stalemated and would not meet the needs of the public without some official action.

The review of The Plan for the 70's was started in late 1974. One resource group was assigned the task of analyzing Standards and Degrees. The topics assigned this group were:

1. Admission of first-time entering freshmen who are non-residents of Oklahoma.
2. Admission standards for Group I and Group II Colleges.
3. Admission Standards who are candidates for the Applied Science Degree.
4. Articulation of students among institutions in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.
5. Admission of high school seniors.
6. Use of CLEP General Examinations for Advanced Standing Credit.
7. Correspondence and Extension Courses for Advanced Standing Credit.

The committee was composed of individuals from all levels of institutions in the state. It reviewed the articulation agreement that was in force among the state junior colleges and four year colleges. In November of 1975 a modified version of the agreement was considered by the committee for recommendation to the state regents. The staff of the state regents presented the proposed articulation agreement to the state board and it was adopted on December 15, 1975.

The conditions of the articulation policy would not come into full force until the fall of 1978. Time was allowed for institutions to adapt, if necessary, to the conditions of the policy.

The information contained in the following state regents enrollment statistics provides data that supports the need for a system-wide policy.

Enrollment Data

Fall	Public Four Year Colleges & Universities	% of Enrollment	% of Increase	Public Junior College	% of Enroll.	% of Increase	Total
1973	81,957	78%	.10	23,533	22%	15.4	105,490
1974	83,842	76%	2.3	26,744	24%	13.6	110,586
1975	91,141	73%	8.7	33,610	27%	25.7	124,751
1976	91,274	72%	.15	36,262	28%	7.9	127,536

The data indicates that Oklahoma is following the trend of the rest of the nation by showing a continuing increase in the number of students enrolling in two-year colleges. At the present time on a national basis, approximately fifty percent of all entering freshmen start at a two-year college and the percentage is continuing to increase.

In the revised plan for the 70's the following table and narrative indicates the status of enrollment patterns in the fall of 1975.

TABLE VI

FRESHMAN AND SOPHOMORE ENROLLMENT IN OKLAHOMA HIGHER EDUCATION
FALL 1975

Type	Freshman Enrollment	Freshman Share of Market	Sophomore Enrollment	Sophomore Share of Market
Public				
Comprehensive Graduate Universities	10,110	17.9	7,611	26.4
State & Other Universities	13,507	23.9	6,820	23.7
Two-Year Colleges	23,239	41.1	7,851	27.2
Branches & Other Colleges	3,260	5.8	1,967	6.8
Total	50,116	88.7	24,249	84.1
Private				
Graduate Institutions	2,231	4.0	1,844	6.4
Baccalaureate Institutions	2,447	4.3	1,668	5.8
Two-Year Colleges	1,720	3.0	1,057	3.7
Total	6,398	11.3	4,569	15.9
GRAND TOTAL	56,514	100.0	28,818	100.0

When lower-division enrollments are analyzed by class and by type of institution, the roles which the various institutions play in the education of students becomes clearer. Table VI presents data which reveals that the public two-year colleges enroll approximately twice the number of freshman as any other institutional type, equal to more than two-fifths of the total. At the sophomore level, however, all three institutional types in the public sector enroll about the same proportion of the market, and the share garnered by the public junior colleges falls to approximately one-fourth of the total. Also, the private colleges and universities become much more important at the sophomore level than at the freshman. Whereas these institutions enroll only 11 percent of the Oklahoma higher education freshmen, they enroll about 16 percent of the sophomores.

As indicated previously, the overwhelming majority of new lower-division students entered the state system through the public junior colleges during the past five years.

The reaction to this new policy was predictable. Some of the members of the faculties of the universities rushed to the battlements with the all too familiar cry concerning encroachment on academic freedom and faculty rights. Others did not react since the topic has been around for a long time and nothing had happened before--this too shall pass. While to others it brought an awareness that times are changing, that the institutions do belong to the people, and it is higher education's role to determine how to meet these needs. It also should be noted that there is usually a great difference between rate of awareness and rate of acceptance of new ideas.

Dr. Fredrick Kintzer, in a report to the American Council on Education, summarized the present state of articulation conditions on a national basis. He ends his article this way:

> "The Minnesota Plan, one of the most recent to be announced, stresses the importance of individualizing and personalizing procedures as much as possible, and emphasizes the value of voluntary cooperation.
>
> In attempting to anticipate the future of articulation/transfer, the rapidly increasing presence of state government is of crucial importance. The power direction appears to be inevitable - from interinstitutional to state agency or commission pacts, from coordination to control. As the responsibility becomes centralized in a single state unit, great care must be taken to maintain flexibility. Uniformity tends to result in diminishing options for transfer students. It is unrealistic to decry the trend. Instead, the education and political spheres must work closely and creatively to design manageable and open systems." [4]

His admonition is an accurate one and should be heeded.

In a September 1976 newsletter at the Oklahoma Conference of the AAUP a published resolution decries the validity of the new policy.

WHEREAS the Executive Committee of the Oklahoma Conference of the AAUP affirms its adherence to the long-established principle (endorsed by the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, as well as the AAUP) that the faculties of individual institutions are responsible for setting requirements for the degrees they offer; and

WHEREAS the policy on articulation of students issued by the State Regents for Higher Education in December 1975 contains provisions whose effects, by denying individual institutions the right to set lower-division general education requirements higher than a maximum level declared acceptable by the State Regents, are in conflict with this principle; and

WHEREAS the Executive Committee holds that this principle is so important that it is neither desirable nor educationally sound to allow it to be set aside in pursuit of the worthy goal of an improved transfer process within the State's institutions of higher education;

THEREFORE the Executive Committee calls for the State Regents to modify their articulation policy to bring it into conformity with the principle of faculty responsibility for setting degree requirements. [5]

The statement amplifies the problem and delineates it as well. For institutions in the state system of higher education, lower division general education requirements are a responsibility of the faculties that teach within the entire system, not only within a specific institution.

It is the lack of recognition of this greater task and the development of programs that can serve more than native students that creates the problem. The task was not impossible but it needed to be recognized before it could be solved.

In response to the concerns raised by some segments of higher education in Oklahoma the State Regents held meetings in April of 1977 to review the articulation policy. At these meetings representatives from all the types of institutions of higher learning in the state were provided the opportunity

to present their concerns and points of view about the articulation policy. After two meetings the state regents modified the policy. (Attachment #5) The policy now in force differs in only one area from the original policy. That statement is:

> 1. A student who has completed the prescribed lower-division requirements of a State System institution developed in accordance with the standards set forth in Section I above, including the basic 33 semester hour general education core, may transfer into a bachelor of arts or a bachelor of science degree program at any senior institution of the State System and be assured of completing his or her program in sequential fashion. Senior institutions may, with the approval of the State Regents, require that transferring students complete additional general education work for the degree. However, such additional work shall be programmed as a part of the upper-division requirements of the senior institution in order that any student shall be able to complete a baccalaureate program in a number of semester hours equal to the total specified for graduation published in the receiving institution's official catalog.

With this statement the state regents have strengthened the policy significantly and provided a sound basis from which institutions can work in developing general education sequences. This statement, in effect, mandates communication and cooperation. It is a statement that allows diversity or conformity and leaves the curricular processes in the hands of the institutions. With this approach the regents have taken a different tack than other controlling agencies and may have set a pattern for other states to follow.

Support for system institutions comes from the state and allegiance should be to the people who pay for the system. A state system of higher education cannot be elitist. The state systems were formed to provide egalitarianism in higher education in America and the community/junior college is the latest step in that direction. It would seem that

professionals who work in the system should be dedicated to the principles that govern the institutions. Private education may and in some cases does have elitist philosophies and thus can proclaim total institutional autonomy from other schools in the area. Their statement of accountability is always very near at hand. They must meet the specific needs of their supporters or close their doors for lack of financial support.

Clearly, the issue in public education is the right of the conscientious and able student to enter the state system at point A, the junior college, transfer to point B, for upper division work, and exit with the earned credential experiencing a minimum of conflict in the transition process.

To date it appears that most articulation agreements have not been created in an atmosphere where, as Kintzer puts it, "institutions work closely and creatively to design manageable and open systems." Rather, the agreements have been hammered out in an advisory relationship.

The long range importance of the agreements will far overshadow the minor misunderstandings that have been raised during the developmental processes. In essence, the agreements are not set in epoxy or etched in stone. They do form a basis for concrete discussions between and among institutions of higher education about the basic content of college degrees, a subject that very much needs attention.

Articulation agreements are indeed statements of accountability and in many ways they could be considered one of the first thoroughly dissected and analyzed agreements in higher education. As such they are limiting, yet they provide consistency and accountability in a state system.

If the present agreements are still in existence ten years from now, unmodified and sterile, they will have not fulfilled their promise.

It appears that the intent of statements from several states requiring articulated programs mandates a set of guidelines to be used as a springboard for continued dialogue within systems of higher education. And for the purpose of achieving to the maximum degree possible, the dialectic of promoting diverse opportunities and experiences that culminate in a common goal, a college degree.

APPENDIX 1

Listing of Names and Institutions

MINUTES OF MEETING

Organization: Oklahoma Intercollege Council on Student Transfers

Time and Place: May 8, 1967 at 1:30 p.m. at Oklahoma Christian College

Present:

J. N. Baker	Eastern State College
W. Harvey Faust	East Central State College
Leo D. Harmon	Bacone College
Lila G. Gross	Northwestern State College
George W. Metzel	The University of Tulsa
William J. Meyer	St. Gregory's College
Peter Green	St. Gregory's College
Ernest L. Holloway	Langston University
Melvin Self	Connors State College
M. A. Diel	Southwestern State College
Stafford North	Oklahoma Christian College
Sam Evans	Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts
Raymond Girod	Oklahoma State University
Lyle Tullis	Central Pilgrim College
Harper L. Cole	Bethany Nazarene College
Bill E. Fisher	Central State College
Sam Pool	Southeastern State College
W. C. McQueen	Oral Roberts University
G. E. Burson	Northern Oklahoma College
B. Kenneth Lewis	Phillips University
H. Louise Craven	Murray State College

APPENDIX 2

Council on Student Transfers

March 7, 1968

Intercollege Council on Student Transfers

Re: Similarity of lower division requirements of the senior colleges and the universities

1. Requirements common to all:

English	6 hours
History and Government	6 hours

2. Requirements common to most:

Physical Education
Speech
Science
Humanities
Social Science
Math

3. Requirements common to several:

Orientation
Foreign Language
Additional English

Conclusions

a. While only a very few hours (English and History) are common to all institutions, a large percentage of all requirements are common to most institutions; or, at least, are acceptable to satisfy requirements.

b. It is estimated that the following could be said concerning the 60-hour lower division curriculum:

(1) Approximately 3/5 of the hours would meet lower division requirements at any institution in the State.

(2) Approximately 1/5 of the hours could be electives which would be acceptable at any institution.

(3) Approximately 1/5 of the hours would need to be selected to meet specific requirements peculiar to the particular institution.

c. It appears that lower division requirements at the respective senior institutions do not vary as widely as may have been thought. It seems likely that a basic lower division core curriculum could be worked out, with a few options to adapt to the respective areas of major and the respective senior institutions.

APPENDIX 3

FALL MEETING
of
THE OKLAHOMA INTERCOLLEGE COUNCIL ON STUDENT TRANSFERS

Thursday, November 20, 1969 Central State College

9:30 Registration and Coffee - Seminole Lounge, 4th Floor, College Center
Dr. Bill Fisher, Host
Central State College

10:00 Meeting Convenes ----------Council Room, 4th Floor, College Center
Dr. Bill Price, Chairman
University of Oklahoma
Greeting by: Dr. Garland Godfrey
President
Central State College

10:15 Innovative Collegiate Academic Calendars---Council Room, 4th Floor, College Center

Dr. Edwin E. Vineyard, Moderator
President, Northern Oklahoma College

Panel

Dr. Gerald Burson, Dean of Instruction, Northern Oklahoma College
Dr. Robert Martin, President, Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts
Dr. George Metzel, Registrar, University of Tulsa

(General discussion follows)

12:00 Luncheon ($2.00 per person) - Ballroom C, 3rd Floor, College Center

Speaker

"Regents' Views on Academic Calendars"
Dr. Dan S. Hobbs
Educational Programs Officer
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

1:30 The Transfer of Mathematics Courses-------Council Room, 4th Floor, College Center

Dr. B. Kenneth Lewis, Moderator
Dean, Phillips University

Panel

Four mathematicians will discuss problems associated with intercollegiate transfer of mathematics courses and credits. The viewpoints of large universities, state colleges, church related colleges and universities, and junior colleges will be presented on the panel.

(General discussion follows)

3:00 Adjournment

APPENDIX 4

ARTICULATION OF A STUDENT TRANSFER AGREEMENT
AMONG THE JUNIOR COLLEGES, THE SENIOR COLLEGES,
AND THE UNIVERSITIES OF OKLAHOMA

March 28, 1973

This agreement among the junior colleges, senior colleges, and universities of the State of Oklahoma acknowledges the needs of the individual student as well as the interests of the State and society. College students of today are mobile in their search for an education. As part of an effort to assist these students, the institutions of higher education in Oklahoma agree to cooperate in developing curricula that will permit students to transfer from one institution to another with a minimum loss of progress toward their educational objectives.

1. Each junior college, senior college, and university participating in this agreement shall list all graduation requirements for each program leading to the associate and/or baccalaureate degree and shall publicize this information for the use of students and other higher education institutions in the State. Participating institutions are encouraged to work cooperatively in the development of curricula but each institution has the continuing responsibility of determining the character and extent of its own programs. After an institution has developed and publicized its programs, the integrity of these programs will be recognized and honored by other participating institutions. The catalog in effect at the time of the student's initial full-time enrollment in a participating institution shall govern graduation requirements provided continuous enrollment has been maintained as defined in the catalog of the institution granting the degree.

2. The determination of requirements for a degree program shall be the responsibility of the institution awarding the degree. However, the thirty semester credit hours of general education courses as specified in Appendix A will be accepted by all participating institutions as fulfilling part of those degree program requirements.

3. The function of each institution in the state system of higher education determines the nature of its offerings. Junior colleges may offer introductory courses (1000-2000 level) which permit the student to explore the programs that can be pursued at the baccalaureate level. Major course requirements (3000-4000 level) should be offered only at the senior colleges and universities because of the foundation needed to profit fully from these courses. Acceptance of course credits earned toward non-transfer associate degree or certificate programs will be determined by the senior institution on the basis of applicability of the courses to the baccalaureate program in the major field of the student. For all baccalaureate degree programs a minimum of 60 semester

credit hours must be completed at a senior institution, and the minimum residence and course requirements must be completed at the senior institution granting the degree.

4. Each student should be made aware of his or her responsibility in meeting requirements for an associate and/or baccalaureate degree. Transfer students should be encouraged to choose as early as possible the institution and program which they plan to enter. Each institution of higher education will accept the responsibility for providing guidance to the student making degree-related decisions.

5. An Articulation Committee, with members to represent the three types of institutions (junior college, senior college, university), shall be formed for purposes of continuing and expanding discussion and exchange of information. This committee may advise or recommend to the presidents of the institutions concerned but shall have no power of approval. Experimental programs in all institutions are encouraged. These proposed experimental programs shall be reported in writing to the Articulation Committee, and the reports shall include information on the purpose, design, participants, duration, and the results of the experiment. A junior college, senior college, or university wishing to engage in a joint experimental program with another college, which would involve variation from the existing transfer policy, shall request advisory comments from the Articulation Committee before entering into the program.

APPENDIX A

GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

1. English . . . . . 6 hours
   Must include the two basic college-level courses in English composition.

2. Social Sciences . . . . . 9 hours
   Must include six hours of American history and government as required by the State Regents for Higher Education. The remaining three hours must be chosen from sociology, psychology, anthropology, economics, non-physical geography, history, or other social science courses.

3. Natural Sciences . . . . . 6 hours
   Most choose courses from the life sciences, physical sciences, or earth sciences. Some baccalaureate degree programs in engineering and technology will accept only specified physical science courses.

4. Humanities . . . . . 6 hours
   Must choose courses from history and appreciation of art, music, and theatre; English, American, and foreign literatures (excluding language skills courses); religion; philosophy (excluding logic or critical thinking); courses titled humanities or history of civilization.

5. Electives . . . . . 3 hours
   Must choose three hours from college-level mathematics, foreign languages, or any of the courses listed in the above categories. Engineering baccalaureate programs will accept only specified mathematics courses.

---

*Students should be given every opportunity to fulfill the general education requirements through advance standing or other means of submitting evidence of prior learning.

APPENDIX 5

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
State Capitol, Oklahoma City

POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ARTICULATION OF STUDENTS AMONG INSTITUTIONS IN THE OKLAHOMA STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Article XIII-A of the Constitution of Oklahoma provides that the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education shall constitute a coordinating board of control for all State System institutions with certain specified powers including (a) the prescribing of standards of higher education for each institution, (b) the determination of functions and courses of study in each of the institutions to conform to the standards prescribed, and (c) the granting of degrees and other forms of academic recognition for completion of prescribed courses in all of such institutions.

Oklahoma currently operates 26 public institutions of higher education, including 14 two-year colleges, 10 four- and five-year universities, and two comprehensive graduate universities. One of the primary goals of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is to provide access at some public institution for all Oklahoma citizens whose interests and abilities qualify them for admission. Given the large number of individuals who annually seek admission to the State System, it is recognized that no single institution can physically accommodate the total student body, nor can any institutional type meet the diverse needs and demands of all the students for various kinds of educational programs. Therefore each institution and each institutional type has been assigned a specialized role within the total State System, in order that all qualified individuals may be accommodated at some institution, although not necessarily at the institution of first choice.

Oklahoma two-year colleges currently enroll one-half of the entering freshman students in the public sector, with the regional universities and comprehensive graduate universities sharing the remainder of the entering student load. Given this division of labor at the entering level, it is important that continuing access be provided for students in the two-year colleges who desire to pursue an upper-division program at a public baccalaureate institution. The policy statement to follow is designed to guarantee an orderly transition for students in programs leading toward the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science degrees at institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.

I. Standards of Education for Completion of Associate Degrees

The minimum requirements for the Associate of Arts or the Associate of Science degree at any institution in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education shall include the following:

1. The completion of 60 semester credit hours exclusive of basic required physical education or military science courses with an overall grade point average of 2.0.

2. The completion as a portion of the overall 60 semester credit hours of a basic general education core of a minimum of 33 semester credit hours which shall include the following:
   a. English and Language Arts . . . . . 6 hours
      (This must include the two basic college level courses in English Grammar and Composition or evidence that the student has "tested out" of these courses or established proficiency by advanced standing or other acceptable means.)
   b. Social Studies . . . . . 6 hours
      (This must include American History and Government)
   c. Science . . . . . 6-8 hours
      (This must include one 3-4 hour course in Life Science and one 3-4 hour course in Physical Science.)
   d. Humanities . . . . . 5 hours
      (Chosen from courses defined as humanities by the institution granting the associate degree.)
   e. At least one two-hour course from each of two of the following areas . . . . . 4 hours
      Mathematics, Psychology, Foreign Languages, Fine Arts (Art, Music, Dramatics), Practical Arts (Agriculture, Business, Home Economics, Industrial Arts).

   No more than 12 hours in any one area will count toward the basic 33 semester hours of general education.

3. The remaining minimum of 27 semester credit hours of academic work shall be applicable to the student's major objective including any prerequisite courses necessary for his/her anticipated upper-division program. A majority of such student credit hours shall be taken in courses classified as liberal arts and sciences.

4. The general education core of 33 semester credit hours shall be considered minimal and each institution may, with the approval of the State Regents, develop additional lower-division general education requirements for its own students.

II. Guidelines for the Transfer of Students Among Institutions

In order that students completing the above degree requirements may move vertically through the State System with a minimum loss of time and financial outlay, the following guidelines for transfer of students among institutions are hereby adopted for The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education:

1. A student who has completed the prescribed lower-division requirements of a State System institution developed in accordance with the standards set forth in Section I above, including the basic 33 semester hour general education core, may transfer into a bachelor of arts or a bachelor of science degree program at any senior institution of the State System and be assured of completing his or her program in sequential fashion. Senior institutions may, with the approval of the State Regents, require that transferring students complete additional general education work for the degree. However, such additional work shall be programmed as a part of the upper-division requirements of the senior institution in order that any student shall be able to complete a baccalaureate program in a number of semester hours equal to the total specified for graduation published in the receiving institution's official catalog.

2. It is understood, however, that it might be necessary for teacher education candidates to take additional courses in general education to meet minimum certification requirements, as defined by the state, i.e., health and physical education, geography, Oklahoma History, etc., or similar additional requirements of other professional fields. It is also understood that the completion of these requirements does not preclude requirements of senior institutions of particular grade points for admission to professional departments or fields.

3. It is further understood that it is the responsibility of the transferring institution to provide adequate counseling to enable a student to complete during the freshman and sophomore years those lower-division courses which are published prerequisites to pursuit of junior-level courses in his/her chosen major disciplinary field.

4. The baccalaureate degree in all Oklahoma senior-level institutions shall be awarded in recognition of lower-division (freshman-sophomore) combined with upper-division (junior and senior) work. The lower-division general education requirement of the baccalaureate degree shall be the responsibility of the institution awarding the associate degree providing the general education requirements specified herein are met. If, for any reason, a student has not completed an approved general education program prior to his transfer to another institution, the general education requirements shall become the responsibility of the receiving institution.

5. Lower-division programs in all state institutions enrolling freshmen and sophomores may offer introductory courses which permit the student to explore the principal professional specializations that can be pursued at the baccalaureate level. These introductory courses shall be adequate in

content to be fully counted toward the baccalaureate degree for students continuing in such a professional field of specialization. The determination of the major course requirements for a baccalaureate degree, including courses in the major taken in the lower-division, shall be the responsibility of the institution awarding the degree. However, courses classified as junior-level courses yet open to sophomores at senior institutions, even though taught at a junior college as sophomore-level courses, should be transferable as satisfying that part of the student's requirement in the content area.

6. Other associate degrees and certificates may be awarded by institutions for programs which have requirements different from the aforementioned degrees, or a primary objective other than transfer. Acceptance of course credits for transfers from such degree or certificate programs will be evaluated by the receiving institution on the basis of applicability of the courses to the baccalaureate program in the major field of the student. Each receiving institution is encouraged to develop admission policies that will consider all factors indicating the possibility of success of these students in its upper-division.

7. Each baccalaureate degree granting institution shall list and update the requirements for each program leading to the baccalaureate degree and shall publicize these requirements for use by all other institutions in the State System. Each baccalaureate degree granting institution shall include in its official catalog information stating all lower-division prerequisite requirements for each upper-division course. All requirements for admission to a university, college, or program should be set forth with precision and clarity. The catalog in effect at the time of the student's initial full-time enrollment in a college or university shall govern lower-division prerequisites, provided that he has had continuous enrollment as defined in the college or university catalog.

8. An advisory articulation committee composed of representatives of the various types of institutions within The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education shall be established to work with the State Regents' staff to review and evaluate articulation policies and practices and to make recommendations for improvement as needed.

Effective Date of Policy

This policy shall be effective for institutions granting the associate degree beginning with the 1976 fall semester. Those institutions offering baccalaureate programs shall be expected to implement the policy effective with the fall semester of 1978.

Adopted by the State Regents on December 15, 1975.
(underlining indicates amendment to policy)

References

1. Oklahoma Intercollegiate Council on Transfer Students - Minutes of Meeting.

2. A State Plan for the 1970's Revision and Supplement; Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, April 1976.

3. A State Plan for the 1970's Revision and Supplement; Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, April 1976.

4. Office on Educational Credit American Council on Education. Newsletter No. 16, Fall 1976.

5. Oklahoma Conference American Association of University Professors, Volume 3, No. 1, September 1976.